

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to Draft PWS questions as of 28 DEC 2007.

| Question# | Type of Question | Question | Answer | POC |
|-----------|------------------|--|--|-------------|
| 214 | Acquisition | If the contractor is able to provide the Government with significant technical, cost or schedule improvements through the movement of requirements between spirals, would it be acceptable to move functionality specified within the PWS and still be considered a "compliant" proposal offering? | Yes. | Brian Dudek |
| 215 | Acquisition | Page 40 of the PWS references an integrated Risk Program and associated risk management plan that focuses primarily on program acquisition related risk activities. Will this data be shared with the contractor as part of the formal RFQ? Could this data be made available in advance of the RFQ? | No. That risk plan is acquisition sensitive (programmatic in nature). The technical risks were described at industry day. | Brian Dudek |
| 216 | Technical | Per the PWS Draft, sections 2.5.3 through 2.5.10 (i.e. Low Side Coop Design, IGC Exercise System, Top GTN Queries by Utilization, Retire Legacy GTN, Web Services, Rich Internet/Web 2.0/AJAX/BI, Discoverable Assets) do not appear under Task Area 1, Spiral 3 (section 2.5.2.4). Are the ESP activities related to sections 2.5.3 through 2.5.10 intended to be stand-alone activities within Task Area 1 (i.e. outside of the spiral structure) or are they intended to be within the boundaries of Task Area 1, Spiral 3? | We will update the PWS to realign the remaining requirements (i.e., 2.5.4 through 2.5.11) under Spiral 3. | Brian Dudek |
| 217 | Acquisition | 1.PWS section 2.2, line 889 states that the Task Order for IGC Planning and Transition Services will be issued in conjunction with contract award. Q&A #108 response stated that Contract Award will be June 2008. PWS section 2.5.1.2, line 1838 states that transition activities must be complete by 30 September 2008. From these statements and in conjunction with PWS Table 2.5-3 line 1915, please confirm that the period of performance for Task Area I is as follows: a. Initial Planning & Transition Task Order – July 2008 through September 2008 (3 months), b. Task Area I, Spiral 1 – October 2008 through May 2009 (8 months), c. Task Area I, Spiral 2 – May 2009 through February 2010 (10 months), d. Task Area I, Spiral 3 – March 2009 through July 2010 (17 months) | The final schedule will be contingent upon contract award. However, your interpretation of our requirements and timeline is accurate with the exception of Task Area I, Spiral 2. The Government anticipates an 8 month period of performance to occur over a 10 month project implementation period. Rationale for the difference in period of performance and the project schedule is time required for equipment installation and connection by Government host provider. | Brian Dudek |

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to Draft PWS questions as of 28 DEC 2007.

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|---|-------------|
| 218 | Acquisition | PWS Figure 2.1-2 Implementation Timeline on page 12 (also shown in Industry Day 2 brief) indicates Task Area II Sustainment period of performance to be October 2008 through September 2012 (4 years). Please confirm | It begins contingent to contract award and runs through the end of the contract; that date will be specified in the RFQ. | Brian Dudek |
| 219 | Acquisition | PWS Figure 2.1-2 Implementation Timeline on page 12(also shown in Industry Day 2 brief) indicates Task Area III Extended Core Services period of performance to be October 2008 through September 2012 (4 years). Please confirm. | It begins contingent to contract award and runs through the end of the contract; that date will be specified in the RFQ. | Brian Dudek |
| 220 | Acquisition | Q&A #122 states that the Government will purchase software products/licenses and provide them as GFE to the IGC contractor. In addition, PWS section 2.5.1.3 states that IGC Development environment hardware will be provided as GFE. We assume that typical Bill of Material (BOM) data, while not part of the proposed price, will be required in the proposal response to include part numbers, unit costs, etc. Please confirm. | Yes. | Brian Dudek |
| 221 | Technical | Reference Draft PWS Paragraph 2.5.6 on page 74: "What is the scope of the ESP tasks to decommission and shut down legacy GTN?" The draft PWS seems unclear in this area and does not acknowledge any activity or coordination required between the Legacy GTN Sustainment contractor and the IGC ESP contractor, nor does it define the extent of the "packaging and final documentation" requirements for legacy GTN. | Legacy GTN sustainment will be handled separately from this contract. | Brian Dudek |
| 222 | Technical | Please clarify the use of the term 'accurate' as used in Table 2.8-1 on page 92 in the PWS the sentence '100% accurate information on 95% of items maintained by IGC is available for query.... | Defined in the CPD as 'Accurate refers to all information required for user queries being available and matching data received from data sources.' PWS will be updated. | Brian Dudek |
| 223 | Technical | In reference to Table 2.8-1 on page 92, is the intent of the sentence '100% accurate information on 95% of items maintained by IGC is available for query...' that IGC take measures to ensure the 'accuracy' (as defined in the answer to the previous question) of the information it brokers from source systems? | The purpose is to provide the highest quality data to our end-users possible. Data profiling tools are available within the IGC infrastructure to assist the ESP in determining data quality. The data should not be cleansed inbound to the data warehouse, level 1 raw layer should be completely representative of the state of our source data. Data should be normalized and integrated as data is rolled up to level 2 & level 3 within the data warehouse, this would entail some limited data cleansing activities. | Brian Dudek |

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to Draft PWS questions as of 28 DEC 2007.

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|---|-------------|
| 224 | Technical | Please clarify the use of the term 'Simple Queries' as used in Table 2.8-1 on page 92 of the PWS. | Defined in PWS - 'An interrogation created with 3 joins and 10K rows/tables | Brian Dudek |
| 225 | Technical | Please clarify the use of the term 'Complex Queries' as used in Table 2.8-1 on page 92 of the PWS. | Defined in PWS - 'An interrogation created with more than 3 joins and 30K rows/tables | Brian Dudek |
| 226 | Technical | Please clarify the use of the term 'Extended Queries' as used in Table 2.8-1 on page 92 of the PWS. | Extended queries provide transportation beyond the current operational picture (120 days) for purposes other than gaining intransit visibility or supporting C2. Extended queries could cross multiple data sets, multiple universes, and be aggregating large amounts of data within the EDW. | Brian Dudek |
| 227 | Management | Performance objectives are described in Task Area 4 section 2.8.2. Does the Government require the capabilities delivered in Task Areas I and III to adhere to the same performance objectives? | Yes. | Brian Dudek |
| 228 | Technical | Please define and give percentages for the term 'high availability' as used in Section 2.5.2.3.6. | The high availability objective is defined as 99.99% \equiv 4.38 minutes/month or 52.6 minutes/year ("four nines") for total up-time. The requirement is that between the two sites a total IGC up-time requirement of 99.99% be met. | Brian Dudek |
| 229 | Technical | Please clarify the use of high, medium, and low complexity as used in Table 2.5-5 on page 62 of the PWS and Table 2.5-7 on page 66 of the PWS or divulge the criteria used in the classification of each feed. | The complexity classification is based on a relative sliding scale in terms of individual feeds in relation to each feed based on historical and current expertise. The high, medium, and low complexity is to aid the contractor in determining relative effort in terms of estimating ETL workflow and translation and integration activities for each of the respective layers. | Brian Dudek |
| 230 | Acquisition | Please provide clarifications (quantitative in nature) for small, medium, and large size, as used in Table 2.5-5 on page 62 of the PWS and Table 2.5-7 on page 66 of the PWS. | The feed size classification is based on a relative sliding scale in terms of individual feeds in relation to each feed based on historical and current expertise. The small, medium, and large size is to aid the contractor in determining relative effort. The size estimation incorporates relative data set size in terms of tables, columns, number of feeds, and size of data within the feed in terms of KB and rows/records. | Brian Dudek |
| 231 | Technical | Section 2.5.4.1 of the PWS states 'IES will support up to three (3) exercise scenarios simultaneously'. To facilitate similar performance and hardware analysis of the IGC system, please also provide the target number of simultaneous IGC users. | Approximately 75 | Brian Dudek |

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to Draft PWS questions as of 28 DEC 2007.

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|---|-------------|
| 232 | Technical | To facilitate similar performance and hardware analysis of the IGC system, please also provide the target number of total IGC users. | Approximately 3,500 total users; only about 200 simultaneously | Brian Dudek |
| 233 | Technical | PWS area 2.1.1.4.9. discusses six major interfaces. In the IDE reading room, the interface documents are provided for some of these areas. It is not clear how many of these interfaces are currently operational or will be operational by October 2008. Please state which interfaces are currently operational and which are planned to be operational by Oct 2008, and when the additional interface documents will be available for those in the planning stages. | Upon kickoff of IGC Spiral 1, the following systems will have established low-side interfaces: TRDM, GFM, portions of CEDI, GATES, GDSS-LO, WPS, portions of DAAS, CMOS, AMS-TAC, COMPASS, IBS, CSS, and RFITV. We will publish technical data for any TRDM, GFM, CEDI, GATES, GDSS-LO, WPS, DAAS, or RFID interfaces not already published on the secure site, in late January. The remaining interface documents will not be available until late Spring. | Brian Dudek |
| 234 | Technical | Are there any additional IDE service interfaces being planned for PWS area 2.1.1.4.9.3 beyond the Air Force and Navy interfaces available in the reading room? | If there are new requirements for IDE service interfaces they will be handled under Task Area III. | Brian Dudek |
| 235 | Acquisition | As it relates to the Information Assurance Section (Section 2.3.4) does the definition of the contractor as both ESP and FAD as defined in Section 2.2 Contract Scope apply? | Yes. | Brian Dudek |
| 236 | Technical | In section 2.4.4 Build Phase there is a reference to "readiness testing" how does this testing fit into the testing phases that are outlined in section 2.4.5? Please clarify. | This portion of the PWS is being updated. | Brian Dudek |
| 237 | Technical | In section 2.4.4.2 Milestone Review: Test Readiness Review is it the government's intention that this TRR would occur before the test phase begins as described in section 2.4.5? In addition, what are the expectations for the Government-witness testing at this point in the development phase? It would seem that this review would occur after the Integration Testing as described in section 2.4.5.5. | The TRR will occur prior to the Contractor entering Test Phase. | Brian Dudek |

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to Draft PWS questions as of 28 DEC 2007.

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|---|---|-------------|
| 238 | Management | Section 2.4.4.2 (Milestone Review: Test Readiness Review) and 2.4.5 (Test phase) contain numerous testing events and milestones. Clarification, possibly in the form of a diagram, would be helpful to fully understand the relationship of the test activities to the milestones and to what environments are used to support these activities. For example, is it the intent of Section 2.4.4.2 of the PWS that GWT be performed prior to TRR? If so, then is GWT meant to be witness of Unit Level Testing since Integration is not performed until the Test Phase as described in section 2.4.5.5? | This portion of the PWS is being updated. | Brian Dudek |
| 239 | Technical | Table 2.5-6 (Spiral 2 Data Feeds) on page 65 of the PWS lists JOPES-H as a feed to be loaded into the IGC system. The JOPES system currently employs row level access controls to restrict which users are allowed to see specific data. Will IGC need to implement row level access controls on the JOPES-H data stored in the IGC enterprise data warehouse (EDW)? | Access controls will need to be commensurate with source system and functional regulations. Further detail will be included in the Spiral II CPS. | Brian Dudek |
| 240 | Technical | In PWS 2.3.10, Data Quality Rows 1273-1274 Sentence reads "The DQI/POA shall identify method(s) for identification of data cleansing and data discrepancy resolution." Data Profiling is one of several methods for identifying data discrepancies. Data Cleansing could take many forms and varying levels of scope from manual "fixing" to applying systemic tools for cleansing. This is the only reference to "cleansing" in the PWS. Is "data cleansing" within scope of the IGC PWS? If so, to what level is cleansing expected? | Yes, Government requirement that ESP vendor will propose level. | Brian Dudek |
| 241 | Other | Figure 2.4-1 "Requirements Analysis Flow Diagram" on page 44 of the PWS contains 'High Level Training Plans', 'Training Design', 'Training Artifacts / Plan', and 'Deliver Training', but neither creation nor delivery of these materials is specified in the subsequent sections (i.e. 2.4.2, 2.4.3, etc.). Will creation and delivery of the training materials be included within the scope of IGC (sections 2.4.2, 2.4.2.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.3.2, 2.4.4, 2.4.4.2, and 2.4.6)? For example, should the training material be developed during the phase indicated in Figure 2.4-1 and delivered for the subsequent review? | Training should be developed as part of Spiral III. | Brian Dudek |